

ers, and an interference with their freedom and independence; and if such armed force be in the hands of or under the control of the partisan friends of any particular candidate, the probability of improper influence becomes stronger."

It matters not that the armed militia did not visit the polls. They were stationed very near to, and ready at any moment to be called to the voting places. They were under arms, subject to the command of a partisan governor, and, as a majority of the people believed, had been called out in violation of the law and for the purpose of interfering with the civil authorities. This was sufficient to raise the greatest fears in the breasts of peaceful people. The result shows that almost one-fourth of the registered voters were kept away from the polls. Eight thousand six hundred of these were Democrats, and only one thousand and two hundred and six were Republicans. Whether the fact that the militia was in the hands of a Republican governor, encouraged and emboldened the citizens of that party to come out and vote, and intimidated those of the other party, can never be known; but, certain it is, as said by the supreme court of Arkansas, in Jones vs. Glidewell, that "the rule obtains in elections, as in other affairs, that a man shall not profit by his own wrong, nor by that of others done for him to reap the benefit. The only means by which approximate justice may be reached, when the illegal acts render the result doubtful, is to require the party to whose benefit they inure to purge the polls of their effect, or suffer the penalty of having its majority excluded from the count of its votes."

The result in the city of Louisville was rendered doubtful by the unlawful acts of the Republican executive. To purge the polls where the wrong was diffusive was impossible. The law therefore, inflicted the other penalty, viz.: exclusion of the majority received by the party for whose benefit the wrong was done.

Basis in Law and Fact.

Thus, whether the decision of the board and the general assembly be considered with reference to tissue ballots, or military intimidation, there is ample basis in law and fact upon which to rest. Mr. Yerkes, however, seems sorely grieved because the board and general assembly did not, in their finding, disclose exactly how they arrived at the conclusion that William Goebel was legally elected governor, and J. C. W. Beckham was elected lieutenant governor; he complains that the general assembly did not read the evidence, and that there was no statement as to what votes were thrown out, nor tabulation of the vote, as revised. In a word, Mr. Yerkes would like a special verdict.

It may confidently be stated in the first place that the board and the general assembly did that which the constitution and law required of them. They "determined" the contest. There is no requirement that they shall report how the result was reached; and in the second place, I would make answer and say that William S. Taylor, at the point of the bayonet, drove the general assembly from the legislative halls, and sought, by force and threats, to prevent their meeting, at any time or place, to consider the contest, except in London, on February 6, by which time it was believed and hoped by him, and those acting with him, that the bullet of the assassin would have accomplished its purpose.

Yerkes Defends Taylor.

What right has the party that indorses these lawless acts of Taylor, intended to hinder the consideration of the contest, to question the technical regularity of the procedure before the board, or the general assembly, which it interrupted and wantonly sought to prevent? What right has Mr. Yerkes, as the nominee of that party, to do so himself? He spoke from a platform, at Bowling Green, with Holland Whitaker, in proper person, upon one side, and the picture of Taylor upon the other. By this he would conquer in this campaign. His platform approves these acts of Taylor. In his speech he defends him. The act of Taylor in interfering with the deliberation of the board and the general assembly is his act.

It is but a short distance from his Danville home to Frankfort. He must have known, as a lawyer, that Taylor had no right to expel the legislature from its halls, or adjourn it to London, or interfere with its session in the city of Frankfort; he must have also known that Taylor had no right to these lawless acts, to postpone the hearing and determination of this contest; he must have known that the friends of Mr. Goebel would insist upon the general assembly disregarding the brutal proclamation of Taylor, and proceed with the hearing and determination of the contest at once. As a lawyer he knew that the surest way to insure regularity in the procedure was to allow the general assembly to occupy its halls, and proceed unmolested with its duties. His manifest duty as a citizen and the friend of Taylor demanded his presence in Frankfort. The Democrats were powerless; he was all powerful. If it was at all important to have a special finding of fact from the general assembly, he knew it then as well as he knows it now. If he believed then that Taylor had no power to interfere with the general assembly, he should have so advised him. If he believed that he did, and advised and approved Taylor's interference, in law and in morals, he is estopped to explain, and is equally in the wrong with Taylor.

An Artful Evasion.

But the horror and indignation which filled the breasts of the people on account of the foul assassination of Gov. Goebel has, to some extent, prevented a full discussion and consideration of the most serious and important question developed by the unhappy events of the past twelve months. That question Mr. Yerkes has artfully evaded. He has grown eloquent in discussing the results of the election law, and depicted, in glowing colors, the fearful wounds which liberty has received on account of the enactment of this law; but he has refrained from expressing himself as to the assault, made by Taylor, as

governor, upon the general assembly, and its attempted adjournment from Frankfort to London.

The Republican platform indorses Taylor's action as governor. Mr. Yerkes stands upon that platform. He defends Taylor in his speeches as both "honest" and "patriotic," but yet never a word upon the important question of the power of the executive to drive the general assembly from its chambers in the capitol.

Mr. Yerkes cannot dodge this question. The people of Kentucky will not allow him to do so. They will demand to know, and have a right to an answer, whether, in the first place, he approves the act of Taylor itself, and, whether, in the second place, in his opinion, the executive of the commonwealth has this extraordinary power. The important question which the people of Kentucky demand that Mr. Yerkes shall answer is this: Can the executive disperse the legislature at the point of the bayonet while in the orderly discharge of its duties, and adjourn it to whatsoever point may suit his own corrupt purposes?

If this extraordinary power exists over the legislative department, then it can only assemble at any time or place and remain in session only so long as the executive may desire it to do so. Its independence is destroyed. By the constitution the general assembly is invested with the supreme legislative power of the commonwealth. As a sovereign body, it may meet and adjourn when and where it will, subject alone to the limitations of the constitution. This instrument, which divides the power of the government into three departments, confers no authority upon the executive to prorogue the general assembly. The makers of our organic law, in providing for the independence of the legislature, had in mind, no doubt, the fact that the English kings exercised this despotic power over the parliament, and that the colonial governors exercised like powers over the legislative bodies of the colonies. In stating our grievances in the Declaration of Independence, it was charged that the king "has dissolved representative houses repeatedly for opposing with manly firmness his invasion of the rights of the people; that he has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures."

Taylor's Despotism.

The despotic acts of the king and the colonial governors, in reference to the legislature, which led to our separation from the mother country, are harmless and insignificant beside the revolutionary actions of Taylor. The royal power was only used to dissolve or adjourn the legislatures. Taylor assaulted the general assembly and drove it from the capitol at the point of the bayonet; he drove it from the public buildings of the city, and finally sent his military officers to the capitol hotel and informed the proprietor that if the general assembly was permitted to meet there he would take possession of the building itself. The tramp of his soldiers was heard in the hall near the door of the room where his victim lay dying.

These acts are approved by the Republican platform. The perpetrator of them is eulogized by Mr. Yerkes as "honest" and "patriotic." He appeals to the people to elect him governor because he says an unjust law was enacted by the legislature in 1898, which interferes with civil liberty, and he desires to right this wrong. If he really believes that Taylor was "honest" and "patriotic," he is not qualified for governor. If he says so to catch the votes of the mountain assassins, he is only a demagogue and unworthy the support of good citizens.

The act of Taylor strikes at the very foundation of our government. If Taylor could lawfully disperse the legislature, then John W. Yerkes could do so if elected governor. If one executive may do this then all may do it, and the independence of this department of the government be destroyed. It is therefore important that Mr. Yerkes declare himself upon this vital question which so deeply concerns the people of the commonwealth. If he shall defend the action of Taylor at the time and under the circumstances will he tell the people of the commonwealth whence the executive derived the extraordinary power claimed. Will he give to the people his construction and exposition of the law upon this subject?

What Will He Do?

Finally the people of the commonwealth would like for Mr. Yerkes to tell them whether, if elected governor, and requested, in accordance with the law, to issue his requisition for W. S. Taylor and Charles Finley as fugitives from justice, he would do so? Will he, in good faith, seek to have them returned to Kentucky to answer the indictments against them? If he will not answer and say whether he will pardon these fugitives from justice will he tell the people whether he will grant a requisition upon the governor of Indiana and endeavor to have them returned to Kentucky for trial? He has declined to answer whether he will pardon upon the ground that "facts might arise and circumstances be discovered" which would influence him, and therefore it is improper for him to commit himself. But this cannot be the case in reference to the requisitions. The indictment has been returned. These men are fugitives from justice. The constitution requires the executive of the state from whence they fled to make demand upon the governor of the asylum state. Will Mr. Yerkes do this, if elected?

The Republican party, by the declaration of its platform and its nominee, is committed to the policy of Taylor, which is a policy of force and arms. The Democratic party stands for government by law. Which shall prevail?

In order to evade this issue, if possible, the campaign orators and Republican press insist that the sole issue is "civil liberty" and "honest elections." This is an attempt to mislead and obtain a vote of confidence from the people of Kentucky under false pretenses. The Republican party never stood for either of these principles.

Republican History.

What are the antecedents of this party upon these subjects, in the nation?

It plundered the treasury of every Southern state; it disfranchised the intelligent white man and conferred the elective franchise upon the brutal and ignorant freedman. Elections were a farce. Offices were filled by corrupt and ignorant, and the citizen deprived of his elective franchise, held life, liberty and property at the will of the political buccaneers, whom the Republican party installed and kept in power.

In 1876, when Mr. Tilden was elected to the presidency, it deliberately stole this high office. The states of Louisiana, Florida and South Carolina were robbed of their electoral votes. The most infamous returning boards were organized in these states under the laws of the carpet-bagger, and the steal thereby accomplished. Great as was this wrong, no one was assassinated. Year after year people of the South elected Democratic members of congress, but a contest inaugurated by a characterless carpet-bagger, or freedman, was all that was necessary to accomplish the disfranchisement of that unhappy people. This precedent has been closely followed to the present time. In the last three congresses a Republican majority has unseated the Democratic members elected in the Second Virginia and Fourth Alabama districts, although the majority ranged from three to five thousand.

The Force Bill.

Only a few years ago the Republican party in congress, made a party measure of the infamous Lodge "force bill," and William McKinley, then a member of the house of representatives, voted for it. It failed by a single vote in the senate. In view of the fact that the Republican orators and press have so much to say about election laws, and insist that the present law is a violation of the principles of local self-government, it is well to consider this bill, which the New York Sun, and other leading Republican papers of the North and East, are insisting should become a law at the next session of congress.

By this law the federal judge is authorized to appoint three supervisors of elections for each state, in which the law is in force; these state supervisors, in turn, appoint three county supervisors, and they appoint supervisors for each polling place. The federal authorities appoint as many deputy marshals to attend the polls as the supervisors think necessary. If the state officers fail to open the polls at the proper time, the federal supervisors are authorized to do so; they have the right to challenge voters and require them to be sworn. The county supervisors certify the result to the state supervisors, and the latter certify as to the election of members of congress and presidential electors. If there is a conflict between the certificate of the federal supervisors and the state officials, the certificate of the former controls. It will be observed that the source of power, under this law, is the federal judge, and that the people have no vote in selecting any of these officials. Twenty sections of this law are set apart to creating offenses against it. The federal court alone is given jurisdiction to try these offenses, of which there are at least one hundred. Nearly all of these offenses are declared to be felonies, punishable by confinement in the penitentiary.

No Line of Condemnation.

You have never read a line in a Republican platform, state or national, which has condemned any of these acts or measures of this party. John W. Yerkes stands today, as he stood at all times, in full accord with his party on these measures and policies. The violation of the principles of local self-government by the Lodge bill receives his approval.

It is possible that the party which, through the most corrupt instrumentalities, deprived three sovereign states of their electoral votes, is now crying out for honest elections? Can it be that a party which has, at all times in its history, when it had a majority in the house of representatives, unseated Democrats whenever it desired to increase its majority, is now inveighing against the decision of an election contest?

Can it be that a party which despoiled the Southern states, and well nigh destroyed every vestige of civil and political liberty there, is now the honest advocate of civil liberty in Kentucky? Can it be that the party which advocated the infamous force bill, which violates every principle of local self-government, state and county, is now honestly and in good faith opposed to the Goebel law, because it takes from the local authorities the power to appoint election officers? If so, when was the change wrought? Would it not be well for Mr. Yerkes to confess the sins of his party before he appears as the champion of civil liberty and honest elections?

As it has been in the nation, so has it been with this party in the state. It enjoys the unenviable distinction of being the only party which has used the military for intimidation at the polls; the only party which has used tissue ballots; the only party which has used the military to intimidate the general assembly, and the only party which has resorted to assassination to remove a political adversary.

A Disgraceful Period.

The platform declares that "we congratulate the Republican party on the efforts of Gov. Taylor and his co-officials" to secure the rights of the people.

The most disgraceful period in the history of Kentucky is that wherein these "efforts" of Taylor and his co-officials were made.

The state board of election commissioners assembled at the time appointed by law to canvass the votes cast at the last election. At least 300 armed assassins were brought to the city of Frankfort to intimidate these commissioners. They filled the capitol, and day after day crowded the very antechamber of the then Republican governor of the commonwealth. This "effort" in behalf of civil liberty has been traced directly to "Taylor and his co-officials."

While the contest was being heard

"Taylor and his co-officials" brought to the city of Frankfort at least a thousand desperate ruffians for the purpose of intimidating the contest board and reducing by assassination the Democratic majority in the general assembly. They were a menace, not only to peace and good order, but to life itself. When arrested for open and confessed violations of the law, Taylor pardoned them as fast as he could learn of it, and turned them loose upon the community again with a warrant to defy the law. This is another one of the "efforts" of Taylor indorsed by his party platform.

The Assassination.

Another effort of "Taylor and his co-officials" was the assassination. The world knows from the evidence that he had guilty knowledge of the intended crime. Caleb Powers furnished the office and details for consummating the crime. Taylor stood in thirty feet of where the assassin knelt when he fired the fatal shot. Dressed in the brief authority of governor, he used its power to the utmost to prevent the apprehension or discovery of the assassins by the civil authorities. He surrounded himself with the militia of the commonwealth and inaugurated a reign of terror.

Fearful lest his brave adversary might live long enough for the contest board and the general assembly to determine the contest, he prepared a proclamation, in which he attempted to adjourn the general assembly to meet February 6 in London. There is no language strong enough to express the horror with which many honest citizens viewed this flagrant violation of the law. No attorney of respectability at the bar, insofar as I am aware, except upon one occasion, has ever sustained this infamous "effort" of Taylor.

Not content with having driven the general assembly from its historic chambers, where for well nigh a century it has convened to enact laws for the commonwealth, Taylor, by force and arms, drove the members from the public buildings in the city, and threatened if the general assembly should meet therein, to occupy with the military the hotel wherein his victim lay dying. This "effort" of Taylor has also been indorsed.

On the sixth day of April Taylor said, in his published card: "I am not a criminal; neither shall I ever be a fugitive from justice." It was well known that the supreme court would decide the case of Taylor vs. Beckham on May 22. The first train that left Frankfort that morning bore Taylor to Louisville, and lodged him in the bosom of Collector Sapp, in the custom house. There he remained secreted until the electric spark flashed the decision of the court at Washington. A closed carriage was hurriedly summoned to the back entrance, and Taylor, with Sapp and Cureton, entered and were driven rapidly to the Jeffersonville ferry, and thence crossed to the state of Indiana. That night he reached Indianapolis, and said:

"I am tired and worn out and need rest. I don't know where I will get it, but since Gov. Mount's action in Finley's case I believe Indiana will do for the present."

No doubt he still sighs for "rest." The assassin's rifle will ever ring in his ears, while in his midnight dreams and noonday visions he sees the form of his murdered victim as it sinks to the earth.

Taylor's Abject Flight.

This abject flight of Taylor, from Kentucky to Indiana was his last supreme "effort" in behalf of liberty. He was so deeply in love with liberty that he was determined to have it, even if he had to go to Indiana for it.

All of these efforts of Taylor and his co-officials have been indorsed by the Republican platform, and Mr. Yerkes stands upon and approves this platform. He must bear the odium and infamy of it all. If elected governor he proposes to administer the government according to its principles, and will act upon the assumption that Taylor was both "honest" and "patriotic."

Do the people of Kentucky want any more like "efforts" in behalf of civil liberty, and do they want the government of the state administered as Taylor did? Do the doubting, hesitating Democrats of Kentucky feel that the politics of the state will be purified and the commonwealth benefited by the success of that party, which in the past has disfranchised entire states, and now stands for McKinleyism in the nation and Taylorism in the states?

Over and against this party of greed and blood stands the Democracy—the party of the constitution and the law. Every voter will be compelled to answer at the polls the solemn question: Shall the commonwealth be governed by law or by force and arms? I appeal to you to answer like brave Kentuckians.

WHERE IS TAYLOR NOW?

"There remains but one course open to him (Taylor), and that is to return as soon as he can, walk boldly and bravely into court and meet the indictment like a man. Any other course would be rank injustice not only to himself, but to those of his friends who have been accused of so foul a crime. I do not know whether the indictment has been found against Mr. Taylor, but I have no doubt if it is that he will promptly surrender himself into the hands of the law, and believe that any intimidation to the contrary does him injustice."—Ex-Gov. Bradley, April 2.

"Once for all, I desire to say neither directly nor indirectly had I any connection with the assassination of Senator Goebel. I am a citizen of this state, amenable to its laws; I am not a criminal, neither shall I ever be a fugitive from justice. Whenever indicted, if such an outrage should be committed, I shall appear for trial, conscious of my innocence and the ultimate triumph of right and justice."—W. S. Taylor, April 7.

COL. YOUNG

TAKES MR. YERKES TO TASK AT PARIS.

A Spirited Reply to Some of the Utterances of the Republican Candidate.

Col. Bennett H. Young spoke at the court house at Paris Tuesday night to an audience of white citizens as large as the mixed assemblage which heard Mr. Yerkes in the afternoon. The court room, in which Col. Youngs spoke, was filled with people and the doors were choked with voters.

Col. Young was escorted to the platform amid wild cheers and applause. He was introduced by Judge Mann, and spoke for an hour and ten minutes.

He said in part:

In his speech at Covington Mr. Yerkes said: "There seems to be some doubt, some jealousy, perhaps, as to who are Mr. Beckham's legal guardians. I see in Col. Bennett H. Young's speech that when Mr. Beckham was seated, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Young and one or two others were appointed to advise with him and to control his future actions, and now I see that ex-Gov. McCreary and Charlie Wheeler are constituted his political nurses."

Well, maybe there is some question as to who are Mr. Beckham's advisers. I enjoyed the friendship of Gov. Beckham's father and his grandfather. I claim only to be his friend. He can give me nothing I would have, but one thing I am dead sure of, and that is that no one of the gentlemen Mr. Yerkes has named as Mr. Beckham's advisers would ever suggest to him to approve assassination, to issue pardons to the murderers of a state officer, shot down in cold blood from a window in the executive building, or to be base enough to hide such a murderer from the officers of the law, or to put bayonets in the hands of assassins to keep these officers of the law from searching the public buildings to find the murderer, or to unlawfully use the public funds to keep an army of desperadoes in the state capital to intimidate state officials or to adjourn the legislature to some place like London, where those opposing him could be expeditiously killed; or to furnish known assassins, in advance of trial, with pardons, or to provide murderers with United States and Kentucky uniforms for disguise and soldiers in the pay of the state to escort them to a place where they might defy the law.

Yerkes Needs a Guardian.

When Mr. Yerkes' thirst for office brings him to the political depth where he can excuse or justify such infamy, or make him so timid and cowardly as to refuse to stand up in a manly and courageous way to condemn it, then a fair-minded public will say that Yerkes wants some guardians, and that he had better at once get somebody to nurse him.

There never was in the history of this great state, or in the annals of its brave people, a more pitiable sight than a man of Mr. Yerkes' professions and standing going over the state crying out "civil liberty," and yet so wanting in true political courage as not to say whether he does or does not approve of the conduct of W. S. Taylor while acting as governor.

One of two things is true: If he condemns it and keeps silent, he is false to his convictions and not honest with the people whose suffrage he seeks; if he does not condemn or approves what Madman and Murderer Taylor did, then he is unworthy of the support of the brave, patriotic and law-abiding people of this great commonwealth.

A Humiliating Event.

The idea that a man who offers himself as the representative of his party for the office of governor of Kentucky, who in this hour, when the state is in a great crisis, when a fellow-citizen has been assassinated on the very steps of the capitol building, going to discharge his duty as a law maker, shall be afraid to say whether he approves or disapproves of the conduct of those assassins, is one of the most humiliating events on the pages of Kentucky's history.

Again, Mr. Yerkes in his Covington speech said: "The murder of Goebel was a crime of blackest hue, but it was a conspiracy of one, two or a dozen individuals. Why should the Republican party be held responsible for the individual act of one, two or a dozen persons?" And that is all that a man who, the Republican party says, is its best man, has to say about the most shocking crime of this age, a crime that makes civilization shudder, that makes law-abiding citizens stand aghast with its awfulness.

"A few individuals," did you say, Mr. Yerkes? You knew when you uttered those words that Taylor's fellow-conspirator, Powers, in his defense had said that he (Taylor) then a governor, made so by the Republican nomination and Republican votes, was taking Republican campaign money to bring down to Frankfort a horde of assassins and murderers to intimidate the legislature and others; had said, if need be, to kill some of its members, if the necessary conditions arose; that this same governor had placed bayonets at the breasts of the men who searched the executive building for the murderers and bled them beyond, and had pardoned and helped these same murderers to escape from the jurisdiction of the court, and who, with its own hand, had written the Republican platform, which declared the man guilty of these things while doing them to be "resolute and patriotic in

defense of the people's right." Such declarations belittle the manhood and intelligence of the men and women of Kentucky.

Yerkes and Assassination.

Mr. Yerkes is a lawyer, he is a law professor, he teaches young men the principal of law and the true doctrine of life, and yet he says that this infraction of human and divine law is only the act of a few individuals. Yet he wrote the clause in the Republican platform which endorsed and approved them and which says these monstrous acts are "resolute and patriotic" and "in defense of the rights of the people."

If they are the acts of a few individuals, why did the Republican party deem it necessary and proper to endorse them? Republican campaign money hired the villain who fired the shot that put William Goebel to death; a Republican officer kept the arms of these assassins, checked the guns they brought to Frankfort; a Republican governor pardoned them in advance of trial and the Republican party endorsed the man as "patriotic" who permitted these outrages, and yet a man of Mr. Yerkes' sense and intellect says the Republican party must not be held responsible for these crimes against life and liberty, when Mr. Yerkes, it is reported, himself wrote the section which commends the assassination as the work of resolute patriots and defenders of the people's rights.

Mr. Bradley, when he was nominating Mr. Yerkes for the place as Republican candidate for governor, said "it was ten times as bad to say that Taylor would run away from Kentucky and not stand a trial for Goebel's murder as to shoot Goebel down in the capital grounds when on his way to discharge his duty as a state senator and now Mr. Yerkes speaks slightly of this fearful act, dismisses it with a sentence and actually goes on to speak as if this cruel assassination was hardly worse than holding an office to which one was not elected."

If Mr. Yerkes keeps on talking in this flippant way about the murder of Mr. Goebel people will come to the conclusion that he is not as good as we have believed him to be and that long association with and advising his fellow Republicans, Bradley, Taylor, Finley and Powers, has made him look upon the most desperate crimes with mitigating eyes and that after all the crime of murder, denounced by human and divine law, is not the worst offense a man can commit.

Yerkes first Bradleyized, then Taylorized, then Finleyized, then Powersized, and unless his courage brags him up to the point where he will say whether he does or does not approve of Taylor's acts, the people will come to the conclusion that he is neither brave nor good.

NO ANSWER TO IT YET.

Nearly one month has elapsed since William J. Bryan delivered his famous speech at Indianapolis. The peroration of that speech has been read and re-read by countless thousands of the people of the world. That splendid peroration was not a mere collection of words. Eloquent and forcefully the line was there drawn between the national destiny as conceived by the fathers and contemplated by the followers of William J. Bryan and the "national destiny" conceived by the weak and platitudinous McKinley and the men to whose un-American schemes he yields all too readily. Although the world has become familiar with the peroration of Bryan's Indianapolis speech, no Republican organ has endeavored to answer it, no Republican orator has dared to assail it. Read it again:

"I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibilities of today and measures up to the possibilities of the future."

"Behold a republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world the self-evident proposition that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the government."

"Behold a republic in which civil and religious liberty stimulate all to earnest endeavor and in which the law restrains every hand uplifted for a neighbor's injury—a republic in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares to wear a crown."

"Behold a republic standing erect while empires all around are bowed beneath the weight of their own armaments—a republic whose flag is loved while other flags are only feared."

"Behold a republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength and in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of a universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves autocracies by its silent example and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness."

"Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming a supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the sun, is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

When you are told the McKinley represents the conscience, the intelligence and the patriotism of the country, ask your informant why no Republican has endeavored to answer Bryan's splendid apostrophe to an American national destiny.